



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The sixth and last chapter, "Conclusion," sums up the results of the work. Mr. Mosher's conclusions seem to me correct, but are not based on sufficient illustrative material in the earlier part of his work. The various forms assumed by the *Exemplum* during its long history can be brought out clearly only by frequent examples given at length. The tendency to the secular entertaining story and jest should also have received greater attention, and, owing to lack of material, the specific English stories are slighted. The statement on p. 138, "Local color then became occasionally noticeable, though distinctive English characteristics were here, as elsewhere among the floating body of universal tales, sparse." Had Mr. Mosher been able to consult the collections analysed in Herbert's *Catalogue*, he would have seen that there are many specific English stories in the *Speculum Laicorum*, etc. A certain number are in Little's *Liber Exemplorum*, noticed by Mr. Mosher.

I have space left for only a few corrections and suggestions. On p. 33, Mr. Mosher speaks of "a Valerian noble," and so on the next page. The noble in question (Gregory, *Dialogues*, iv. 52) is named "Valerianus." On p. 41 we find: "An account of hell by a Scot returned from death," and on p. 42: "The story of Nial, the Scottish deacon, is broken up and told in parts through two sermons. It narrates how this man was dead five weeks and then returned to tell of the awful fire that awaited those who disobeyed God's law against Sabbath breaking." The inference is that the story itself is given in Wulfstan. It is not, but only references to it. Nial was an Irishman, as is understood by "Scot" and "Scottish." Where is the full account of the vision to be found? On p. 110 a story of Mirk's is referred to, which Mirk himself attributes to "the mayster of stories." Mr. Mosher mentions that the story occurs in Gower's *Conf. Amant.*, Bk. vii. 11. 1783 seq. It would have been well to add that it was taken from the third book of Esdras, cap. 3-4, found in the Appendix to the *Vulgate*.

T. F. CRANE.

Cornell University.

Les Femmes Savantes par Molière, edited, with introduction, notes and vocabulary, by CHARLES A. EGGERT. New York: American Book Company, 1911. 12mo., 187 pp.

Molière: Les Femmes Savantes, edited, with introduction, notes and vocabulary, by MURRAY PEABODY BRUSH. New York: Macmillan, 1911. 12mo., xvii + 165 pp.

Molière: Les Précieuses Ridicules and Les Femmes Savantes, edited, with introduction, remarks and notes, by JOHN R. EFFINGER. New York: Holt, 1912. 12mo., xviii + 225 pp.

Three editions of *Les Femmes Savantes* in the space of twelve months! This is more than the most devoted admirer of Molière could have hoped for. Some might even fear that such an abundance of good things might create a feeling of *embarras du choix*. Fortunately, the nature of the editions is sufficiently varied to satisfy all needs, that of Professor Eggert being intended for beginners, those of Messrs. Effinger and Brush for more advanced students, although a complete vocabulary also accompanies Professor Brush's volume.

It is a pleasure to be able to state that all three editions have been made with care. The best sources have in each case been consulted, and a judicious choice, on the whole, has been made from the abundant material on hand. Besides, these neat and pleasing little volumes are remarkably free from misprints.

I cannot help regretting that Professor Eggert has thought it necessary, from what some might call an exaggerated sense of propriety, to leave out of the text "a few lines of no special value, and in what now would be considered bad taste." If some of Molière's plays, rarely read in class, are in need of such expurgations, this is hardly the case in the present instance. Henriette is an eminently proper, sane, and sensible young woman. Her remarks, very innocent after all, merely show that the French of the best society ever expressed their thoughts with more freedom than the Anglo-Saxons of to-day; and this observation, if the students can make it with such anodine shocks to their

feelings and so little danger to their morals, has its value.

Whatever an editor's views may be on this score, he should at any rate see to it that the omissions, if considered necessary, are made with care. By leaving out part of Chrysale's speech, the *mais* with which Ariste begins his reply (p. 334, l. 4: Act II, sc. 2) has no *raison d'être*. As it stands, it would indicate impatience or petulance on his part, which is contrary to the poet's intentions.

In looking over this edition, the following remarks, of no great importance, have occurred to me:

Page 12, note 2. The explanation seems more misleading than the text, which offers no special difficulty. By advising to construe *Ce qu'un tel mot offre de dégoûtant* into *ce de dégoûtant que . . .* etc., one creates the impression that forms like the latter are correct; and again, by stating that *ce* "is here treated like an adverb of quantity, like *tant*, *trop*, etc.," the inexorable logic of beginners might conclude that *tant* or *trop de dégoûtant* is good French. If it is of doubtful wisdom to translate into bad English, it is positively dangerous to paraphrase good French into bad,—14, 8. *Et les soins où je vois tant de femmes sensibles*. The note reads: "With a verb like *vouées* understood." This is incorrect. The line is complete as it stands and *sensible* is predicate complement of *femmes*. If an *Ergänzung* were desirable it should read: *Et les soins où je vois tant de femmes être sensibles*.—14, 13. *Qui se trouve* is exactly equivalent to *qui est* and not to *qu'on trouve*.—15, 12. *de* is not quite superfluous; it helps to express a shade: *de ces beaux côtés* = some such fine traits.—18, 7. I do not see why *embarrasse* should be made to stand with *aveux en face* = confessions face to face. And why not devote a word to *comme* in the same line, the more so since the vocabulary gives no help here, and since modern French would require *combien*.—19, 1. No authoritative edition that I know has *tous*, all have *tout* = *tout à fait*.—23, 12. *Même dans votre sœur* is paraphrased by: *Dans le cas de votre sœur*. The form used by the poet expresses exactly what he means, and

even to-day it would be very proper to say: *j'admire en vous or dans votre sœur la belle âme de votre mère*.—28, 2. I take it that the editor means the *seventeenth* century instead of the *eighteenth*, although the remark applies to both, less, however, to the latter.—30, 2. The indicative *est* is uncommon after *il suffit que* and might be noted in all three editions.—30, 3. *avisé* is neither 'advised' nor 'cautioned' as the voc. has it, but rather with the reflexive, 'devised,' 'found.'—30, 4. This passage is hardly provided for by the definitions of *engager* given in the vocabularies to the editions. Perhaps 'constrain' would be a sufficient addition.—40, 7. *Chanceuse*. The vocabulary states properly that 'unlucky' is the meaning. A note should add that nowadays *chanceux* means 'lucky' and 'risky.' (Cf. *Il a de la chance, de la veine; chanceux, veinard*, etc.)—51, 1, *manque aux lois*. The voc. has: *manquer*, intr., 'fail,' 'be wanting';—à, 'be too late,' 'miss.' *Manquer* is often transitive: *manquer un train, un but*, etc., with the meaning 'miss' and 'be late,' but I know of no case where *manquer à* has the meaning of 'be late.' Here it means 'disregard.' As for *manquer à* before an infinitive, as in p. 54, l. 26, it is no longer in use.—52, 1. *Le corps avec l'esprit fait figure*. The note elucidates: *fait figure* = *fait une figure (de rhétorique, etc.)*. Hardly! 'Forms a whole' or 'has its importance' is about the meaning.—60, 3 and 8-9. The text is, in my opinion, clearer than the notes. If a paraphrase for l. 3 be thought necessary, it could only be *vous lui faites vous mener par le nez*, but surely students who read Molière understand the passive force of an infinitive with *laisser* or *faire*.—61, 8. *Il est vrai*. A note might well state that the modern form would be *c'est* or *cela est vrai*.—62, 2. *Vous êtes pour*. 'You are for,' 'in favor of,' appeals to me more than *vous allez voir* given by the note.—63, 3. 'For our part' rather than 'on our side' as the translation of *chez nous*.—64, 5, and 65, 2. Attention should be called to the omission of the article in both cases.—79, 5. Descartes is called a great physicist and mathematician. Surely he is not negligible as a philosopher!—

101, 19. *Mon cœur court-il au change ou si vous l'y poussez? Est-ce moi qui vous quitte ou vous qui me chassez?* Mr. Eggert writes: "The use of *si* here implies some omitted part after *au change*; for instance, *de soi-même* or *de pur caprice*." This explanation is inadmissible. Messrs. Brush and Effinger are probably right in adopting the one given by the edition of the *Grands Ecrivains*, namely, that *ou si vous l'y poussez* is an "ancien tour très correct, qui fait suivre une première interrogation de forme ordinaire, d'une autre [commençant] par *si*." It is perhaps interesting to note that this is not admitted by every one. At a recent performance of the play at the *Comédie Française*, I heard these lines pronounced without any interrogation mark after *poussez*, or any stop, save perhaps the length of a comma. The actor then (Mr. Dessonnes) considers *ou si vous l'y poussez* as an ordinary *if*-clause. Prof. Lanson, however, questioned on this passage, kindly writes me: "C'est l'édition qui a raison. L'acteur de la Comédie Française n'a pas compris le texte, et en a par une pénétration arbitraire, faussé le sens."—109, 10. *rien*, which the editor proposes to supply, should come after *ait* or *fait*, not after *que*.—109, 13. *c'est tout dit* is not equivalent to *c'est tout dire*, but to *c'est entendu* = that's an admitted fact.—109, 12. The grammatical nomenclature adopted by Mr. Eggert is open to criticism. In the present instance he calls *à monsieur* a direct object of *voir*. Similarly p. 121, n. 8, where *se*, the indirect object of *faire immoler*, is called the indirect object of *on*. On p. 124, n. 4, he states that *à votre mère* is the direct object of *apprendre*, whereas it is distinctly an indirect object, the direct one being *à vivre*.—129, 6. (In the Ef. and B. editions l. 1624.) *Où vous arrêtez-vous?* Mr. Eggert makes *où* equivalent to *pourquoi*, it seems to me without good grounds. A few lines further (l. 10) we have: *le choix où je m'arrête*; the first *où*, if pronounced by Philaminte, can therefore mean only: *à quoi*. Ef. and B. do not remark upon this hemistich and Mr. Brush's vocabulary gives no adequate translation for the vexing *où*. The word would seem much more logical in the mouth of the notary

and would then mean: *où arrêtez-vous votre choix?* The replies of Philaminte and Chrysale, the latter forming echo to the former, would also be better balanced, but there is no textual authority for such an emendation. Apparently the difficulty was felt at an early date, since the edition of 1734 bears the direction "*Au notaire*" after Philaminte's name.—134, 6. Whatever meaning the editor chooses to attribute to *mystère*, the etymology is always the same and it is probably not *ministerium* (see Körting, *Lat. Rom. Wörterb.*, 1907, and *Dict. Gén.* by H. and D.).—135, 12. *écu* is translated in the voc. by 'dollar,' which is Americanizing Molière rather too much. While the five-franc piece is sometimes called *écu de cinq francs*, in the seventeenth century, the crown was worth three livres and sometimes six (*écu de six livres*). Mr. Brush gives the proper translation.

The vocabulary is carefully made and very full. Since Chaillot and Auteuil are included, why not *calendes* and *ides*? What authority is there for the statement that Auteuil was formerly called Hauteuil? Under *à* and as an example of verbs requiring regularly *à*, *penser* does not seem the best choice, since expressions like *je pense pouvoir le faire*, *je pense du bien de mes amis*, will occur readily to fairly advanced students. Under *instance*, the *d'* should be omitted or *des instances* substituted.—Under *y* and under *tenir*, *y tient trop* is translated by 'cares too much for'; but in the verse where it occurs (p. 103, l. 1) it has the meaning of 'is too intimately joined to it.'

Professor Brush has solved in the vocabulary most of the idiomatic difficulties, so that the notes are more exclusively of a literary, historical and even philosophical nature. So far as I have tested it, the vocabulary is very satisfactory. Neither under *tout* nor under *jeté* do I find the meaning of *tout jeté*, l. 192. About the notes I venture to offer the following remarks:

Line 24. On account of the two *de's* in l. 23 and on account of the distance between the first part of the question and the second, *de* would not be used before *Se faire les douceurs*, the rule notwithstanding.—286. The

note to this passage is confusing. The statement that "this use of the impersonal pronoun with *falloir* followed by an infinitive was most common at this time" would naturally mislead the student into believing that *il faut* + inf. is no longer frequent. Further, the comment that most common "was also the omission of the pronoun of the reflexive verb when preceded by another verb" indicates that the editor considers the *vous* of this line as the indirect object of *faut*. It can hardly be anything else than the direct object of *exiler*, placed, in accord with the common practice of the seventeenth century, before the principal verb. The editors of the Grands Ecrivains hesitate between the two interpretations which would still be possible: *il faut que je vous exile* and *il faut que vous exiliez*. Mr. Brush states that the modern equivalent for this passage is the latter. It might also be the former, or simply *il faut vous exiler*.—291. The quotation on the omission of the article is irrelevant here. In *le détour est d'esprit* no article was expected, *d'esprit* meaning *spirituel*. It should have been made for l. 725 and l. 730 which are passed by unnoticed.—333. *Dieu vous gard'*. The note says that the regular pronunciation of the verb in this expression is *gar* and not *garde*. I was particularly attentive to this word at the Comédie Française and am convinced that the *d* was distinctly sounded, which is, moreover, in accordance with the common usage. The Grands Ecrivains edition (quoted by Effinger) states prudently that "*le d' était sans doute insensible dans la prononciation,*" *sans doute* meaning no more here than *très probablement*.—347. *Nous donnions chez les dames romaines*. The vocabulary translates: 'We had many a gallant adventure,' and so they had, since they made *des jaloux*. But *donner chez* does not imply all that, it had merely the force of *fréquenter assidûment*, or as the G. E. edition has it: "*nous nous lançions chez.*"—376. *Qu'on n'a pas pour un cœur*. A fuller explanation of this curious construction would have been welcome.—436. The word *femme* should be inserted before *légitime* at the end of the note.—470. *pitiés*; no idea of pity contained in this word; Belise

speaks ironically and means that Chrysale considers the gross infractions of Martine as trifles (*des misères*).—494. Bélise has not given any etymologies, why then does the note say that they resembled those of *Ménage*? And has not the latter found more good ones than bad ones?—530. The *pot au feu* is still to-day the favorite dish of the French laboring classes, and for two good reasons: it is cheap and it is delicious.—559. The gerundive in this line could still be employed and differs from Lafontaine's cited in the note as parallel. If a pause is made after *parlant* in Chrysale's speech, there is no ambiguity possible; *un solécisme en parlant* becomes equivalent to *un solécisme fait en parlant*. In the line from Lafontaine the gerundive could to-day refer only to *l'ami* and so would be excluded.—920. *tous* may not be taken adverbially; the adverbial form in the masc. is always *tout*.—947. It would not be superfluous to state that *c* of *respect* is not sounded to-day at the Comédie Française, despite the rime.—1139. *Si j'étais que de vous*. The note should add that the modern *si j'étais de vous* is as current as *si j'étais à votre place*.—1584. Molière perhaps uses *je vous trouve plaisante à me parler ainsi* in order to make the right number of syllables; *de me parler* would have nothing that is unusual even in modern prose; it would always be preferred to *en me parlant*, too stiff for ordinary conversation.

It was a happy idea on the part of Professor Effinger to edit together *Les Précieuses Ridicules* and *Les Femmes Savantes* and to illustrate his notes with a *Carte de Tendre*. The general introduction of fourteen pages is scholarly and contains a considerable amount of material that will be found of value by students and teachers alike. With introduction, remarks on both plays, map and notes, the fairly advanced student will have before him the main elements for a clear understanding of the *préciosité* fad and criticism. A generous bibliography will guide those who wish to proceed further with their studies of the seventeenth century society and literature. The bibliography mentions Livet's *Précieux et Précieuses* of 1859; the latest edition is of 1896. *Molière, le Théâtre, le public, etc.*, is by Mant-

zius, not Manzius. The following comments bear on the notes to the *Femmes Savantes*:

Page 63, line 179. *et faites une mine* is translated by 'you appear,' as though it were the same as *faire mine de*. It means here more directly 'You make a face as though.'—64, 206. *Mais il met peu de poids* does not mean 'he has little power to,' but 'he lays little stress on.'—65, 213. *les visions du leur* is rendered by *leurs visions*, but *leur* refers to *esprit*.—73, 347. *Nous donnions chez les dames*, already discussed above, is here translated by 'we cut quite a figure,' which is not implied in these words.—82, 455. *Oh, oh, peste la belle!* The editor translates *la belle!* by 'you're a pretty creature!' This puts rather much stress on this vocative, while the whole stress should lie on *peste!* and *la belle* should be merely rendered by *my girl!*—105, 798. *Hai, hai* is hardly an interjection of astonishment, but expresses, with a smirk, assumed, but flattered, self-deprecation on the part of Trisotin, who is too convinced of his superiority to be astonished at praise.—110, 837. *celui-là* cannot be called a neuter pronoun; it is distinctly masculine and refers to something understood, *trait d'esprit, calembour*, etc.—124, 1061. *Ce n'est pas mon conte* (mod. *cela ne fait pas mon compte*) means 'that does not suit me,' or 'give me satisfaction,' and not 'I do not intend to,' or 'I cannot.'—144, 1432. *C'est par l'honneur qu'il a de rimer à latin*. Mr. Effinger thinks that *rimer à latin* means rime "with the grace of a Latin scholar." I can see no basis for that translation and I prefer Mr. Brush's literal rendering, 'rime with the word *Latin*.' Mr. Eggert does not remark upon this, so I take it that he also understands it in the latter manner.—151, 1553. *à vous si singulière* is translated by 'which is quite unusual.' I think that Mr. Brush's interpretation 'so peculiar to you,' 'so uniquely your own' is more exactly equivalent to the original.

No French writers are more commonly quoted than Lafontaine and Molière. It would therefore seem highly desirable to call the attention of the students to some lines that have almost become household words with the French and of which *Les Femmes Savantes* furnishes

a large share. I indicate by numbers and at random, after the Ef. and B. editions, some of the commonest ones: ll. 73-74; 419; 465; 477; 531; 543; 598; 1063; 1284; 1296; 1304; 1320; 1396; 1480; 1520; 1544; 1644; 1645-46; 1665; 1749; 1775-76; and l. 217, very appropriate these days.¹

J. L. BORGERHOFF.

Western Reserve University.

The Rise of the Novel of Manners: A Study of English Prose Fiction between 1600 and 1740. By CHARLOTTE E. MORGAN. New York, The Columbia University Press, 1911. ix + 271 pp.

Perhaps the greatest achievement of Miss Morgan's dissertation is its fresh indication of the immense possibilities of detailed research in the comparatively unworked field she has selected. Indeed, in the very state of affairs she has helped to reveal lies the source of her most notable difficulty, that of giving a comprehensive, well-ordered interpretation of what is still so much involved. Even those of us who feel the time ripe for the interpretative monograph of considerable scope are likely to experience a new thrill at the temerity of this undertaking. Still, paths must be broken, and Miss Morgan displays commendable modesty in presenting herself as a pioneer. Her book, she confesses at the outset, "is but a clearing of the ground in a field where little has been done and much remains to be accomplished." She stresses rather the significance of her valuable and extensive Bibliography of English fiction prior to 1740, although this too makes no claim to completeness. She is over-precise in acknowledging indebtedness to such previous

¹The following misprints have been noted. Eggert: p. 74, n. 4 should be numbered 5; p. 110, n. 18, *bleu* read *bleus*. Brush: period after l. 246; the suspension points after l. 275 are superfluous. Effinger: p. 104, l. 777, read *donnez-nous*; p. 110, l. 840, read *j'eus* for *j'ai* (although there is authority for both); p. 178, note on next to last line should refer to l. 957; p. 220, note to 1187, read *interrogation*.